



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,693	01/03/2006	Hiroaki Koyama	CSP-115-A	8753
21828	7590	10/22/2008	EXAMINER	
CARRIER BLACKMAN AND ASSOCIATES			LIN, KUANG Y	
24101 NOVI ROAD				
SUITE 100				
NOVI, MI 48375				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/22/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

cbalaw@gmail.com  
cbalaw@ameritech.net  
wblackman@ameritech.net

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/532,693	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KOYAMA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Kuang Y. Lin	<b>Art Unit</b> 1793	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kuang Y. Lin. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Mr. Petrik. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 17 October 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic    b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant    2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes    e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: claim 6.

Identification of prior art discussed: the art of the record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached.    g) ☒ was not reached.    h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The attorney stated that the duration of the peening treatment in the range of 5 to 10 seconds is a critical process parameter in the instant invention and is unobvious in view of the prior art references. However, it is the examiner's position that applicant failed to provide any evidence to show why it would not have been obvious for those of ordinary skill in the casting art to obtain the optimal peening time through routine experimentation..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Kuang Y. Lin/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793	
---	--